

O. P. Kuznetsova, A. A. Kuzmenko, E. A. Yumaev

Omsk State Technical University (Omsk, Russian Federation)

MEGA-CLUSTERS AS A TOOL OF INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION IN TOURISTS FIELD

In order to diversify the Russian economy, it is necessary to pay great attention to the emerging sectors of the economy; with a systemic approach they are able to reveal their accumulated potential. Authors consider one of such industries to be the sphere of tourism. Russia has its own unique natural-recreational and cultural-historical potential, which is not fully utilized, and it is confirmed with the relevant statistics. The authors propose to accelerate the development of tourism by raising the level of interregional cooperation from the position of using coexisting competition and competitive coexistence in tourist mega-clusters. Due to the lack of financial resources for separate regions for the tourism development, the implementation of this approach is effective, as it allows achieving savings of money due to economies of scale. The phenomena of coexisting competition and competitive coexistence in the tourism sphere presuppose the unification of the different regions authorities' efforts for the joint implementation of projects. Regions joining forces on the basis of coexisting competition and competitive coexistence within the mega-clusters will allow each administrative-territorial unit to develop and improve its competitive advantage by asking a stimulus to the development of the other participants. This approach makes it possible to obtain other positive effects noted in the study. Thus, findings broaden the knowledge about the phenomena of coexisting competition and competitive coexistence in the regional economy, about mega-clusters as tools for interregional interactions in the tourism sphere.

Keywords: region, tourism, coexisting competition, competitive coexistence, co-operation, competition, cluster, import substitution, tourism infrastructure, economies of scale

Introduction

Modernization of the Russian economy, the need to seek measures for revitalization of the economy requires the development of fair competition stimulating widespread active innovations. Very interesting is proposal of B.S. Zhikharevich to increase attention to such phenomena as “competitive coexistence” and “coexisting competition”, they are based on the combination of cooperation and competition but in different proportions. In the first case there is more cooperation, in the second there is more competition [1, p. 4]. Competitive coexistence/coexisting competition due to “economies of scale” allows saving when there is implementation of joint projects.

Competitive coexistence/coexisting competition can be considered between individuals, companies, regions. The study conducted examined these phenomena in relation to the regional economic policy in terms of the development of tourism potential at the interregional level.

Russian Federation State program “Development of Culture and Tourism” for 2013–2020 years¹ calls for reinforcing interregional cultural relations and tourism transfer to innovative way of development. Russian researchers have noted the absence of a concerted action between both as public authorities of various RF subjects, as between commercial entities on the issue of consolidation of efforts and formation of a unified strategy to promote the tourist market [see 2, p. 37]. Moscow, St. Petersburg, Krasnodar and Stavropol territories show the greatest activity in this sphere in the modern Russian history and it is natural.

¹ About approval of RF state program “Development of culture and tourism” for 2013–2020: RF Government Decree of April 15, 2014 N 317 [Electronic source]. Access from the legal consultancy system “Consultant Plus” (date of access 05.05.2016.)

It is important to offer the Russians a tourist product that in terms of hospitality service, the quality of infrastructure and the cost would not inferior or superior foreign offers in the era of globalization in the context of growing competition between countries.

On the other hand, the rapid development of the tourism industry would be a means of creating a positive image of Russia in the eyes of the world community.

Formulation of the problem

Russia badly needs to diversify its economy and to overcome oil dependence. Export of tourism services is not able to replace fully raw energy export, but in case of successful development of tourism industry, if it is focused not only on the domestic, but also foreign tourist flow, the economic situation of the country is much better established. Russia has great cultural and historical potential, unique natural camping and recreational resources; and they are the main prerequisite for the successful tourism development. Each region of Russia in the event of implementing a systematic, consistent approach is able to achieve success in the tourism field development.

The appeal of a tourist destination, according M. Cucculelli and G. Goffi is directly related to its active performance and victories at prestigious national and international forums [3]. a director of Tourism Development Centre of the Sverdlovsk region E. Tukanov considers interregional cooperation in the tourism sector to be promising. According to her, for example, to promote abroad the “Great Ural” brand extensive routes should be developed, and they are not to be limited to administrative boundaries of the subjects included in this tourist destination. The foreign tourists may be interested in “Ural” in general, and it is more difficult to interest them with separate “the Chelyabinsk Region”, “the Orenburg region”, etc. [4, p. 17].

The purpose of the research is to determine new innovative managerial approach to develop tourism at the interregional and regional levels.

The object of study is Russian regions. The study subject is the development of tourism in the regions of Russia on the basis of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition.

The methodological basis of the study is presented with methods of scientific generalization, comparative analysis; complex, systemic and situational approaches. The translation of all English-language and French-language sources was completed by the authors.

In the course of study, there were used statistical materials, texts of development programs, press releases, messages and other information of the Official Site of the President of the Russian Federation; Federal Service of State Statistics (Rosstat), Moscow, Russia; Federal Agency for Tourism of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia; legal consultancy system “Consultant Plus”, Moscow, Russia; Ministry of Culture of the Omsk region, Omsk, Russia, magazine “Expert-Ural”, Yekaterinburg, Russia; Interregional Association of Economic Cooperation of Russian Federation subjects “Siberian Agreement”, Novosibirsk, Russia; World Tourism Association / Organisation Mondiale du Tourisme, New York, USA; Travel and Tourism Research Association, Whitehall, USA; General Directorate of enterprises / Direction Générale des Entreprises, Paris, France; National statistical agencies of Canada / Statistique Canada, Ottawa, Canada; official portal of the Government of Quebec Canada’s province / Portail Québec, Montreal, Canada; Tourism Committee of Quebec Canadian province / Tourisme Québec, Montreal, Canada; Federal Statistical Office / Office fédéral de la statistique, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

While preparing the article the authors relied on the works of domestic and foreign researchers of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow (A.D. Nekipelov); Russian Academy of Sciences Institute of Market Problems (V.A. Tsvetkov); Institute for Regional Economy of RAS, St. Petersburg (B.S. Zhiharevich); Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov (A.Y. Aleksandrova); St. Petersburg State University of Economics, St. Petersburg (G.A. Karpova, F.V. Suschinsky); Institute of Economics of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Yekaterinburg (S.G. Vazhenin, I.S. Vazhenina, A.I. Tatarkin); Baikal State University of Economics and Law, Irkutsk (T.R. Novichkova, O.Y. Palkin, E.A. Rzhepkina); Russian State University of Tourism and Service, Moscow (V.V. Lapochkina); Russian International Academy of Tourism, Moscow (I.V. Zorin); Volgograd State Technical University, Volgograd (S.K. Volkov, I.A. Morozov); Saratov socio-economic Institute (branch) of the Russian Economic University named after G.V. Plekhanov, Saratov (I.M. Kublin);

Center for Tourism Development of the Sverdlovsk region, Yekaterinburg (E.N. Tukanova); Harvard University, Cambridge (B. Nalebuff); New York University, the USA (A. Brandenburger); University of Central Florida, Orlando (W. Youcheng); Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg (D.R. Gnyawali; B.-J. Park); The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington (J. Zhang; G. Frazier); Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva (K. Shaul); Polytechnic University of Marche / Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona (M. Cucculelli, G. Goffi); State Research Centre of Henri Tudor / Centre de Recherche Public Henri Tudor, Luxembourg (A.L. Mention); University of Macau, Macau (J. Wu).

Theory

The Russian research terminology defining the unity of cooperation and competition between the territories continues to take shape. There are different proposals on the “adaptation” of the concept “co-opetition”, it became popular through publications of A. Brandenburger and B. Nalebuff [5; 6]. In modern foreign science “co-opetition” has been studied from different perspectives. For example, as an innovative practice in the field of services [7; 8], the basis for the technological innovation development [9], the development model of the optimal contract of cooperation between competitors [10], an effective inventory management mechanism in the industry [11], a promising model of universities cooperation in the creation of innovative products [12], to ensure trust between cooperating parties [13] etc. The concept “co-opetition” has been also studied by foreign scientists in relation to the tourism sector [see, 14].

To adapt the concept “co-opetition” various options are suggested in Russian publications [15]. The authors keep to the approach suggested by B.S. Zhikharevich: to describe the phenomenon in question, using the terms “competitive coexistence” / “coexisting competition”.

As G.A. Karpov, F.V. Sushchinskii point out, “tourist competition” globally increases between the old and new mega areas [16]. The more important, in our opinion, is the development of tourism in Russia with reliance on competitive coexistence and coexisting competition.

V.A. Tsvetkov points out that “integration maturity”, when viewed as a whole, is connected with a high level of economic development, the presence of the general import and export diversification, involvement in international “division of labor”, the presence of “strong democracy” characterized with the rule of law and ensuring predictable behavior and the confidence of the partners [17, p. 22–23]. This approach can be “applied” to other territorial management levels.

A.I. Tatarkin notes that the phenomenon of competition between territories constitutes a new subject of regional/municipal economy and marketing. They are to be identified with the competitiveness of market relations subject not only to develop competitive advantage but to use them in the interests of the system, sustainable development. Particular attention should be given to the retention of the generated competitive advantages. [18, p. 148–149]. A new measurement of inter-territorial competition is due to the following positions [18, p. 149]:

- creating competitive advantages through innovations;
- maximum possible use of innovations for economic development, increasing volume of production of goods and number of services, increasing quality while reducing costs;
- retention of the created competitive advantages due to continuous innovation renovation, expansion of market opportunities.

In our opinion, in order to make use of the ideas of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition become a reality, it is wrong to start global cooperative cooperation between the subjects of the Russian Federation, municipal formations right now under the current conditions. It is necessary to start with the fact that these ideas should be implemented at the interterritorial level in certain sectors/branches of economy, and when the positive results for all participants become apparent, the economies of all territories, more “globally”, will begin real work in the framework of competitive coexistence/coexisting competition. A key role in accelerating this process, in our opinion, will belong to the state authorities’ heads of the subjects of the Russian Federation, heads of municipal entities administrations. The activation of this concept use is very promising in the tourist sphere in Russia.

To illustrate the importance of the tourism industry development, statistical data will be given on the most successful countries in this area (Table 1).

Table 1

World countries in the number of foreign tourists and income from international tourism²

Country	Number of foreign tourists, mln			Income from international tourism, billion Euros		
	2013	2014	Share in 2014 among all world countries, %	2013	2014	Share in 2014 among all world countries, %
The USA	70.0	74.8	6.6	130.2	133.4	14.2
Spain	47.1	65.0	5.7	47.1	49.1	5.2
France	83.6	83.8	7.4	42.6	43.2	4.6
China*	55.7	55.6	4.9	38.9	42.8	4.6
Macao	14.3	14.6	1.3	39.0	38.2	4.1
UK	31.1	32.6	2.9	30.9	34.5	3.7
Italy	47.7	48.6	4.3	33.1	34.3	3.6
Germany	31.5	33.0	2.9	31.1	32.6	3.5
Thailand	26.5	24.8	2.2	31.5	28.9	3.1
Hong Cong	25.7	27.8	2.5	29.3	28.9	3.1
The whole world	1087.2	1133.0	100	902.0	940.0	100

* Excluding Hong Kong and Macao

According to the number of foreign tourists in 2014 Russia took the 9th place in the world (29.8 million). However, the performance was not included even in the top twenty³, and it is, in our opinion, due to the fact that a significant portion of international tourism was provided by the citizens of the former Soviet republics that have low income. The volume of paid tourist services and investments in the Russian Federation estimates at 147.5 billion rubles in 2014⁴.

Number of travel agencies employees of Russia is presented in Table 2. The results lead to the conclusion that the tourism industry has recovered quickly from the global financial and economic crisis of 2008–2009. However, the “second wave” of the global economic crisis, which began in 2014, and, obviously, the growth of international instability caused a new “subsidence” of the tourism sector.

Table 2

The number of employees of tourist companies of the Russian Federation, people⁵

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Russian Federation	39727	48312	47452	48662	50144	45435
Central Federal District	14130	16456	15162	13630	14190	13238
North-West Federal District	5217	6931	5791	8831	9082	5075
Southern Federal District	4108	4800	5478	5126	5217	5342
North-Caucasian Federal District	646	683	787	807	870	954
Volga Federal District	6142	7360	7738	7764	8278	7793
Ural Federal District	2527	3547	3680	3516	3375	3799
Siberian Federal District	4566	5656	5897	6168	6548	6186
Far Eastern Federal District	2391	2879	2919	2820	2584	2303
Crimean Federal District	—	—	—	—	—	745

² Mémento du tourisme. 2015 // Direction Générale des Entreprises [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/memento/2015/2015-12-Memento-tourisme.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

³ Mémento du tourisme. 2015 // Direction Générale des Entreprises [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/memento/2015/2015-12-Memento-tourisme.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

⁴ Volume of paid services and investments in 2014. // Federal Agency for Tourism of the Russian Federation [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.russiatourism.ru/data/File/news_file/2015/5%D1%83%D1%81%D0%BB%D1%83%D0%B3%D0%B8%20%D0%B8%20%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%86%D0%B8%D0%B8%202014.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

⁵ Number of travel agencies employees // Rosturizm [Electronic source]. URL: <http://www.russiatourism.ru/content/8/section/81/detail/4124/> (date of access 20.04.2016)

In Russia, the average number of employees in the collective grouping of economic activities “Tourism” on the basis of the Russian Classification of Economic Activities in 2014 amounted to 1,043.3 thousand people, in 2015 there were 1,273.7 thousand people⁶. We are talking about sectors and their success is largely determined with the results of travel agencies activities to attract tourists (activities connecting with visitors accommodating; the activities of providing catering services, rail, road, water, air passenger transport, etc.). This example illustrates the role of tourism as a locomotive for a number of related sectors of the economy.

In France in 2014 the tourism contribution to GDP is estimated at 7.42%. Domestic tourism consumption in France has provided goods and services worth to 106.4 billion Euros, the international — to 51.9 billion Euros⁷. In the post-crisis (if compare with 2008–2009) 2010–2014 the number of foreign tourists is increasing every year, rising from 76.6 to 83.8 million people, the same happened with the average length of stay⁸.

By early 2015 tourism provides about 1 million jobs for the French⁹, even more in Canada — 1.77 million jobs¹⁰. In the Canadian province of Quebec operation of 31,000 companies is associated with tourism. The province implements the policy based on the assertion that tourism is the key to economic, social and cultural diversity of all areas¹¹. According to the Tourism Industry Development Plan for 2012–2020 in Quebec there were selected five “macro trends” as priorities, taking into account the specificity of natural and recreational resources: winter tourism, natural “adventure” tourism, cultural and event tourism, business tourism, north tourism to the 49th parallel¹².

In Switzerland, a country with area about 41 thousand sq. km, income from tourism totaled 38.5 billion swiss francs in 2014. When the number of economically active population is of 5 million people¹³ the number of people employed in the tourism sector is 209,800 people. Tourism in Switzerland is paid great attention as to export-oriented industries provided 4.6% of annual export earnings in 2014¹⁴.

In the European Union tourism contributes 3.3% of GDP, 4.1% of total employment places (about 9 million). However, if to consider the sector closely linked to the tourism sector, then the figures are even more impressive: 9% of GDP, 10% of employment places (about 22 million)¹⁵.

Similar examples of successful foreign tourism development in different countries can be given. It is important that Russia, with considerable promise, is on the “sidelines” of the global tourism market.

The World Tourism Organisation (Organisation Mondiale du Tourisme) is promoting the idea that international tourism is an important “engine” of world trade, able to stimulate economic growth and create new jobs. The international tourism share in the service export volume in the world is 30%, and in total world export of goods and services it “has” to 6%. As an export category of the global market,

⁶ Annual statistical information on the “Tourism” grouping on the basis of OKVED-2007 // Rosstat [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/enterprise/retail/# (date of access 06.03.2017)

⁷ En France, la consommation touristique progresse de 1,9 % en 2014 // Direction Générale des Entreprises [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2015-11-4p49-comptes-satellites-tourisme.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

⁸ 83,8 millions de touristes étrangers en France en 2014 // Direction Générale des Entreprises [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2015-07-4p-47-Tourisme.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

⁹ Mémento du tourisme. 2015 // Direction Générale des Entreprises [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/memento/2015/2015-12-Memento-tourisme.pdf (date of access 15.03.2016)

¹⁰ Compte satellite du tourisme: module des ressources humaines, 2014 // Statistique Canada [Electronic source]. URL: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/151001/dq151001b-fra.htm> (date of access 15.03.2016)

¹¹ Tourisme — Le Québec // Portail Québec [Electronic source]. URL: <http://www.gouv.qc.ca/FR/LeQuebec/Pages/Tourisme.aspx> (date of access 16/03/2016)

¹² Plan de développement de l'industrie touristique 2012–2020 // Tourisme Québec [Electronic source]. URL: <http://www.tourisme.gouv.qc.ca/publications/publication/plan-developpement-industrie-touristique-2012-2020-itineraires-vers-croissance-245.html?categorie=43> (date of access 07.08.2015)

¹³ Vie active et réminération du travail // Office fédéral de la statistique [Electronic source]. URL: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/03/01/key.html> (date of access 16.03.2016)

¹⁴ Le tourisme suisse en chiffres 2014 / Bern: Fédération suisse du tourisme. 2015. P. 4

¹⁵ Aluas Iu. Tourism policy — European perspective // TTRA 45th Annual international conference // Travel and Tourism Research Association [Electronic source]. URL: http://www.ttra.com/assets/1/7/Tourism_Policy_-_European_Perspective_-_Iuliana_Aluas.pdf (date of access 19.03.2016)

international tourism ranks the fourth after fuel resources, chemical products and foodstuffs. In many developing countries it has a leading position in the national export¹⁶.

Russia and its regions are behind the latest foreign tourism marketing positioning trends; country-leaders moved on to promote “impression economy” [19], i.e. emotions, that can be obtained by tourists.

A.D. Nekipelov and I.V. Zorin connect the Russian economy “stuffy” problem solving with the tourism industry development. First of all, they point to the opportunity of providing employment for citizens who lost their jobs due to the massive closure of industrial plants caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union [20, p. 30–32].

E. A. Rzhepkina, O. Y. Palkin and T. R. Novichkova mark an important change: until recently in Russia the term “tourism” was associated almost exclusively with a trip abroad, the territory of the country has not been considered as a promising destination, so the tourism as an industry was not developed. Imposing economic sanctions to Russia, worsening economic conditions contributed to “cleaning up” the economy from unfair competition, and created prerequisites of domestic tourism active development and the associated growth of small and medium-sized enterprises [21, p. 345].

A. Y. Alexandrova argues that there is a persistent tendency to weaken the barrier function of borders in the modern world due to it during the last 25 years (1990–2015) the effect of boundary factors, cross-border, border on the development of tourism has changed radically [22, p. 18]. More often, state border becomes an element attracting tourists — as a state border itself, and the contrast of its adjoining spaces [22, p. 17]. In spite of psychological barriers associated with the discomfort tourists feel when crossing the border, they did not completely outlive themselves, especially in cases where the boundary separates hostile countries, and it has heavily fortified frontier. The feeling of anxiety often arises in connection with such factors as different languages, culture, currency, ideology [22, p. 16].

Despite the fact that the phenomenon of the state border less hinders the development of tourism, rather on the contrary, it promotes its development on a global scale; we note that the barrier function of the borders (state, administrative, environmental and others) requires additional research. For Russia, the question of overcoming the restraining role of administrative boundaries in the development of tourism is little studied. Studies conducted by A. Y. Alexandrova affect inter-country levels. Despite the tourism globalization the development of tourism policy is still completed with a single territorial unit — the state. Although there are a number of organizations that contribute to the expansion of integration in the world, these organizations create conditions that facilitate the movement reducing the barrier function of boundaries. But tourism as income-generating activities into the country budget is the sphere of regulation of each country, and it is to find opportunities to develop hospitality industry on its territory with the greatest efficiency.

Tourist activity can change the function of the territory through increased tourism district formation. With the development of the tourism sector focal tourist development of the area is gradually transformed into a single tourist space [23, p. 52–57]. In our opinion, this phenomenon can be examined at different levels: local, sub-regional, regional, inter-regional (including cross-country), world. For Russia, when examining inter-regional level the study of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition in the tourism sector is the most perspective.

A. Y. Alexandrova develops tourist “traps” concept in relation to the regional development [23, p. 52–54]. Its essence lies in the fact that the tourism sector is able to give the territory a large multiplier effect, but if there are administrative errors, tourism will be a “trap.” Three major tourist “traps” can be distinguished:

- 1) “Point” approach to tourism development, due to the fragmented structure of the hospitality industry, a low connectivity level of its elements, lack of an integrated approach.

- 2) Varying perceptions of the tourism product from the “producers” and consumers. Businesses and organizations in the tourism sector (except tour operators) do not put at the top angle the category of “tourism product.” Some provide accommodation services, other provides meals, others provide car rental and the fourth provides the purchase of souvenirs, etc. But the consumer has much broader perception — holistic, single — of the proposed product; he wants to get not a service but “an emotion”, “impression”.

¹⁶ Les exportations du tourisme international grimpent à 1 500 milliards d’USD en 2014 // Organisation Mondiale du Tourisme [Electronic source]. URL: <http://media.unwto.org/fr/press-release/2015-04-15/les-exportations-du-tourisme-international-grimpent-1-500-milliards-d-usd-e> (date of access 16/03/2016)

3) There is often occurring misconception that the impression from a trip a tourist gets directly into a tourist destination. Of course, this is a central element of the “journey”, but the overall impression is formed also on the way to the ultimate goal of traveling back and forth. The impression begins to take shape as early as the time of viewing booklets, information on the website, being in the travel agency office, communicating with a specialist for the sale of tours, etc. The long chain from information search of a possible trip to return should be thought out and logically developed.

An example of practical implementation of the competitive coexistence/coexisting competition concept elements in the tourism industry there is tourism cluster development in the Lake Baikal region. One notes its characteristics [21, p. 346]:

- co-operation of tourist business, the formation of a single investment project;
- selection for the tourism cluster “Baikal constellation” of 100 projects distributed geographically through three municipal districts of the Irkutsk region (Irkutsk, Olkhon, Slyudyanka districts);
- the development of a unified system of tourist routes in the Baikal territory of the Irkutsk region and the Republic of Buryatia;
- the launch of a single information and reference product “South Baikal”, which includes the joint event-calendar of events;
- joint presentation of tourism products of the Irkutsk region and the Republic of Buryatia in the international and interregional level exhibitions.

Thus, we note that uniting efforts of the Russian Federation subjects on the issue of development of interregional tourist clusters and brands is still not massive to the beginning of 2017.

Results

In the course of study authors developed a proposal to enhance the development of tourism based on competitive coexistence/coexisting competition in regions of Russia. In our view, the development of several tourist mega-clusters is promising for example, in the Urals, in Siberia, the Volga region, the Caucasus, the Far East and others.

We consider that the proposed mega-clusters will not be overly cumbersome, as in the new Russian history the experience of interregional cooperation has been accumulated within various inter-regional cooperation organizations. As an example one can name developed in 2015, the conception of the project “Siberian tract”¹⁷, it aims at creating a uniform system of cultural and tourist environment enriched with auto tourist services, under a single conceptual approach under a common brand. Participants in the project will be Tyumen, Omsk, Novosibirsk, Tomsk, Kemerovo, Irkutsk regions, Buryatia, Trans-Baikal and Krasnoyarsk territories. At the first stage two groups of activities are provided: investment and information-event related. The basis of the project will be the Public Interregional Coordination Council “Siberian tract” and Association of Intermunicipal Cooperation “Siberian tract”.

Combining the efforts of a group of the Russian Federation subjects-participants of the mega-cluster, undoubtedly, will give high importance to the project and increase the likelihood of obtaining co-financing from the federal budget and from interested investors.

The bodies of state power of the Russian Federation subjects-participants of the mega-cluster should concentrate their efforts on a few priority trends:

1. Development of “Common tourist standard”, which will adhere to all the tourist mega-cluster participants including common rules, principles of tourism services, the development of a unified system of visual signs, the development of single telephone hotline with support for the most common foreign languages, etc.

2. To develop a “Common tourism and logistics center” with the task of forming a unified marketing strategy for tourism mega-cluster, promotion of total brand both in Russia and abroad. The aim of “Single tourist and logistics center” is the development of a system and due to it any tourist who has come to the mega-cluster, foreign or domestic, feels that he is in a friendly, open environment.

3. The emergence of a single educational institution for training staff for the mega-cluster tourism industry. In our opinion, this is a necessary condition for the implementation of “Single tourist standard” in the Russian Federation subjects-participants of the tourist mega-cluster. For example,

¹⁷ “Siberian tract” — Concept of the project // Siberian Agreement [Electronic source]. URL: <http://sibacc.ru/upload/iblock/677/67718678d5faef176f165da3bc277a65.pdf> (date of access 09.04.2016)

these training areas leaders are the Altai State Technical University named after I.I. Polzunov (Barnaul) and Gorno-Altai State University (Gorno-Altai) in Siberia. There are large groups including highly skilled doctors and professors in these institutions of higher education.

4. Selection of appropriate methods of cooperation shall ensure the equal rights of economically unequal development of the Russian Federation subjects-participants of the mega-cluster. The development of “manipulated democracy” when the power is vested to a strong minority, prejudices the interests of the business partners.

One points out key positions to be addressed through **competitive coexistence** (there is more cooperation than competition) for the tourism mega-cluster development:

a) Carrying out joint work in those areas/sectors of the economy that are not unique competitive advantage of a separate subject of the Russian Federation and it allows to obtain economies of scale and implement projects that, in principle, are inappropriate to be promoted alone.

b) Development of conditions for global positioning of overall mega-cluster brand as an attractive tourist destination.

c) To develop a system of encouragement in the form of co-financing from the federal budget or tax benefits, their amount will depend on the level of targets achievement; the latter must be individually set for each territory.

d) Implementation of measures to support inter-regional event management in the different subjects-participants territory will increase both as event-tourism as “geographic” fullness of the trip.

Also one notes the key points to be addressed through **coexisting competition** (there is more competition than cooperation) development of tourism mega-cluster “Fairly Siberia”:

a) The work is carried out by the mega-cluster each participant on their own in sectors that are unique, thereby creating a unique image of the local area.

b) The high level of tourist services is advantageous to be provided in each subject of the Russian Federation, as at the same time it will work to attract tourists to the macro-region and have a positive impact on the recognition of a mega-cluster common brand not only in Russia but also abroad.

c) It is advisable to provide an encouragement system for the tourist mega-cluster participants who have achieved better results in the attractive environment development for tourists, and who maintains tourist places of interest and attractions in order, who actively develops hospitality infrastructure.

d) Each entity of the Russian Federation participant of the tourist mega-cluster can develop wide range of measures to support domestic projects, inter-regional and inter-municipal level projects on their territory so that the planned activities fall into the tour operators calendar.

Individual subjects of the Russian Federation are unlikely to have reluctance to participate in this project, in our opinion. Creating a mega-tourist cluster is a massive project that can be realized only through the joint efforts of several subjects of the Russian Federation. To invest into common activities to develop preconditions for attracting tourists to the mega-cluster “in general” will be all participants of the mega-cluster. The effect obtained for each territory as a result will depend on its competitive strengthening (in relation to other RF subjects) benefits. Accordingly, there is no participation in the general program — there are no results to attract tourists and revive the economy within the Russian Federation subject. The territory, refused to enter into a mega-cluster will “disappear” from the tourist map.

Conclusions

The tourism development is one of the global priorities. However, in comparison with other countries the level of tourism development is low in Russia despite the rich natural and recreational, cultural and historical potential. For this reason, Russia needs a new management approach that promotes the development and use of competitive advantages, positioning in the global tourism market.

This study shows that combining efforts of different regions on the basis of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition within the tourist mega-cluster is promising for diversification and modernization of the Russian economy.

Theoretical studies and categories of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition suggest that foreign authors examine and apply these concepts in various fields. However, this trend is only formed in the Russian scientific researches. The state programs and other normative legal acts of the Russian Federation used the concept of “collaboration”, “cooperation”, but the categories “competitive coexistence” and “coexisting competition” are not used.

Implementing the proposed approach in the field of tourism is of great importance for the economy of Russia and its regions. There are various tourist development support programs at the federal and regional levels; however, despite the measures taken, the Russian tourism industry competes poorly with foreign leaders.

Combining the efforts of regions within the tourist mega-cluster will yield significant results, namely, an increase in the number of jobs, infrastructure development, the formation of a favorable image of the territory, the creation of opportunities for recreation of the local population and foreign tourists, an increase in budget income at all levels, income and living standard increase and quality of population.

To implement the proposed approach and achieve these results, the authors identified the main priorities of public authorities, and key positions to be addressed through competitive coexistence and coexisting competition when developing tourist mega-clusters.

The theoretical significance of the results is to extend the idea of competitive coexistence and coexisting competition in the regional economy to accelerate the development of the tourism industry.

The practical significance of the results has been determined with the possibility of their use by state and local authorities in the development and implementation of socio-economic development programs, tourism development programs.

Areas for further research

In future, it is promising to investigate the practices of stimulation the development in RF interregional tourism mega-clusters and brands, and institutionalization of competitive coexistence of territories; to develop a system of quantitative and qualitative criteria for assessing the results of tourism development based on competitive coexistence and coexisting competition.

References

1. Zhichrevich, B. S. (2011). Strategicheskoye planirovaniye kak faktor stimulirovaniya regionalnoy sotruentsii, [Strategic planning as a factor in stimulating regional cooperation]. *Region: ekonomika I sotsiologiya [Region: Economics and Sociology]*, 1, 3–14.
2. Volkov, S. K., Kublin, I. M. & Morozova, I. A. (2014). Territorial'ny marketing: opyt rossijskogo rynka turisticheskikh uslug [Territorial marketing: experience of the Russian market of tourist services]. *Povolzhskiy trgovno-ekonomicheskii zhurnal [Povolzhsky Trade and Economic Magazine]*, 3 (37), 36–45.
3. Cucculelli, M. & Goffi, G. (2016). Does sustainability enhance tourism destination competitiveness? Evidence from Italian Destinations of Excellence, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, Part B, 370–382.
4. Perechneva, I. (2015). Tvorit' I zarabatyvat' [Create and earn]. *Ekspert-Ural [Expert-Ural]*, 36 (656), 16–18.
5. Nalebuf, B. J., & Brandenburger, A. M. (1997, January). Co-opetition. *Long Range Planning*, 30, 4, 637–637.
6. Rindfleisch, A. (1998). *Co-opetition: by Adam M. Brandenburger and Barry J. Nalebuff*, New York, Currency, 1996, 290, International Journal of Research in Marketing, 1, 79–81.
7. Mention, A.-L. (2011) Co-operation and co-opetition as open innovation practices in the service sector: Which influence on innovation novelty? *Technovation*, 1, 44–53.
8. Bunger, A. C., Collins-Camargo, C., McBeath, B., Chuang, E., Pérez-Jolles, M. & Wells, R. (2014). Collaboration, competition, and co-opetition: Interorganizational dynamics between private child welfare agencies and child serving sectors. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 38, 113–122.
9. Gnyawali, D. R. & Park, B.-J. R. (2011). Co-opetition between giants: Collaboration with competitors for technological innovation. *Research Policy*, 5, 650–663.
10. Zhang, J. & Frazier, G. V. (2011). Strategic alliance via co-opetition: Supply chain partnership with a competitor. *Decision Support Systems*, 4, 853–863
11. Shockley, J. & Fetter, G. (2015). Distribution co-opetition and multi-level inventory management performance: An industry analysis and simulation. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 1, 51–63
12. Wu, J. (2014). Cooperation with competitors and product innovation: Moderating effects of technological capability and alliances with universities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 2, 199–209.
13. Pesämaa, O., Pieper, T. M., Silva, R., Black, W. C. & Hair, J. (2013). Trust and reciprocity in building inter-personal and inter-organizational commitment in small business co-operatives. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*, 2, 81–92
14. Youcheng, W. & Shaul, K. (2008) Destination marketing: competition, cooperation or coopeition? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 2, 126–141.
15. Vazhenin, S. G. & Vazhenina, I. S. (2013). *Konkurentnoye sosuschestvovaniye territorii v ekonomicheskoy prostranstve [Competitive coexistence of territories in economic space]*. Yekaterinburg: Institut ekonomiki Uro RAN [Institute of Economics, Ural Branch of RAS], 2013, 78.
16. Karpova, G. A. & Suschinsky, F. V. (2013). Tendentsii razvitiya konkurentssii mezhdru turisticheskimi destinatsiyami [Trends in the development of competition between tourist destinations]. *Izvestiya Sochinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [News of Sochi State University]*, 3(26), 49–53.

17. Tsvetkov, V. A. (2013). Postsovetskoe prostranstvo: problemy ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi tselostnosti [The post-Soviet space: the problem of economic and political integrity]. *Problemy teorii i praktiki upravleniya [Problems of management theory and practice]*, 1, 15–24.
18. Tatarkin, A. I. (2013). Konkurentnoe pozicionirovanie regionov i territorij v prostranstvennom razvitii Rossii [Competitive positioning of regions and territories in the spatial development of Russia]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Bulletin of the Orenburg State University]*, 8(157), 148–158.
19. Lapochkina, V. V. (2014). Osobennosti ekonomiki vpechatlenij v period konyunkturyx izmenenij na primere rynka turizma: rossijskij opyt [Features of the economy of impressions in the period of conjuncture changes on the example of the tourism market: the Russian experience]. *Servis v Rossii i za rubezhom [Service in Russia and abroad]*, 9(56), 150–160.
20. Nekipelov, A. D. & Zorin, I. V. (2012). Globalnaya ekonomika i turizm v Rossii [The global economy and tourism in Russia]. *Vestnik rossijskoj mezhdunarodnoj akademii turizma [Bulletin of the Russian International Academy of Tourism]*, 1(4), 30–32.
21. Rzhepka, E. A., Palkin, O. Yu. & Novichkova, T. R. (2015) Turizm v Pribajkale: geograficheskij, ekonomicheskij i obrazovatelnyj aspekty [Tourism in the Baikal region: geographical, economic and educational aspects]. *Izvestiya Irkutskoj gosudarstvennoj ekonomicheskoy akademii [Izvestiya of the Irkutsk State Economic Academy]*, 25(2), 343–351.
22. Aleksandrova, A. Yu. (2012). Politiko-administrativnye granicy: ot bar'era k turistskomu resursu [Politico-administrative borders: from the barrier to tourist resources]. *Vestnik moskovskogo universiteta, Seriya 5: Geografiya [Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 5: Geography]*, 3, 15–20.
23. Aleksandrova, A. Yu. (2014). Turistskie «lovushki» regionalnogo razvitiya [Tourist “traps” of regional development]. *Iniciativy XXI veka [Initiative of the XXI century]*, 2, 52–57.

Authors

Kuznetsova Olga Pavlovna — Vice-Rector for Extracurricular Work and Social Issues, Head of the Department of State, Municipal Administration and Customs, Doctor of Economics, Professor, Omsk State Technical University (11, Pr. Mira, Omsk, 644050, Russian Federation; e-mail: kuznetsova@omgtu.ru).

Kuzmenko Arina Aleksandrovna — Assistant, Department of State, Municipal Administration and Customs, Omsk State Technical University (11, Pr. Mira, Omsk, 644050, Russian Federation; e-mail: anglichanochka91@mail.ru).

Yumaev Egor Aleksandrovich — Ph.D in Economics, Associate Professor, Department of State, Municipal Administration and Customs, Omsk State Technical University (11, Pr. Mira, Omsk, 644050, Russian Federation; e-mail: egorumaev@rambler.ru).